

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MELANIE DELAPAZ,
Plaintiff,

v.

ERIKA MARES, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. CV 23-7615 FMO (JCx)

**ORDER DISMISSING ACTION WITHOUT
PREJUDICE**

On September 26, 2023, the court issued its Standing Order Re: ADA Accessibility Cases, (see Dkt. 10, Court's Order of September 26, 2023), which ordered plaintiff to file a request for entry of default no later than seven calendar days after the time the response to the complaint would have been due. (See id. at 2). The court admonished plaintiff that "failure to seek entry of default within seven . . . days after the deadline to file a response to the complaint shall result in the dismissal of the action and/or the defendant against whom the motion for default judgment should have been filed." (Id. at 2-3) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 629-30, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1388 (1962)).

Here, by stipulation of the parties, Estherlidia Castillo's ("Castillo")¹ answer was due no later than December 18, 2023. (See Dkt 13, Stipulation []). Castillo did not answer the Complaint by that date. (See, generally, Dkt.). Accordingly plaintiff was required to file a request for entry of

¹ Castillo is the only remaining defendant in this case. (See Dkt. 14, Court's Order of December 15, 2023).

1 default no later than December 26, 2023, (see Dkt. 10, Court's Order of September 26, 2023, at
2 2), but no such request has been filed as of the filing date of this Order. (See, generally, Dkt.).

3 A district court may dismiss an action for failure to prosecute or to comply with court orders.
4 Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b); Link, 370 U.S. at 629-30, 82 S.Ct. at 1388 (authority to dismiss for failure
5 to prosecute necessary to avoid undue delay in disposing of cases and congestion in court
6 calendars); Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260 (9th Cir. 1992) (district court may dismiss
7 action for failure to comply with any court order). Dismissal, however, is a severe penalty and
8 should be imposed only after consideration of the relevant factors in favor of and against this
9 extreme remedy. Thompson v. Housing Auth. of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir.1986).
10 These factors include: "(1) the public's interest in expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's
11 need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to defendants/respondents; (4) the availability
12 of less drastic alternatives; and (5) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits."
13 Pagtalunan v. Galaza, 291 F.3d 639, 642 (9th Cir. 2002) (citing Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1260-61); see
14 Applied Underwriters, Inc. v. Lichtenegger, 913 F.3d 884, 891 (9th Cir. 2019) ("By its plain text,
15 a Rule 41(b) dismissal . . . requires 'a court order' with which an offending plaintiff failed to
16 comply."). "Although it is preferred, it is not required that the district court make explicit findings
17 in order to show that it has considered these factors and [the Ninth Circuit] may review the record
18 independently to determine if the district court has abused its discretion." Ferdik, 963 F.2d at
19 1261.

20 Having considered the Pagtalunan factors, the court is persuaded that this action should
21 be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and failure to prosecute. Plaintiff's failure to
22 file the request for entry of default hinders the court's ability to move this case toward disposition
23 and indicates that plaintiff does not intend to litigate this action. In other words, plaintiff's
24 "noncompliance has caused [this] action to come to a complete halt, thereby allowing [him] to
25 control the pace of the docket rather than the Court." Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier, 191 F.3d 983, 990
26 (9th Cir. 1999) (internal quotation marks omitted). Further, plaintiff was warned that failure to file
27 a request for entry of default would result in a dismissal of the action for lack of prosecution and
28 failure to comply with a court order. (See Dkt. 10, Court's Order of September 26, 2023, at 2-3);

1 see also Ferdik, 963 F.2d at 1262 (“[A] district court’s warning to a party that his failure to obey
2 the court’s order will result in dismissal can satisfy the consideration of alternatives requirement.”)
3 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, having considered the Pagtalunan factors, the court is
4 persuaded that the instant action should be dismissed for failure to comply with a court order and
5 failure to prosecute.

6 Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- 7 1. This action is dismissed, without prejudice, for failure to prosecute and comply with the
8 orders of the court.
9 2. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

10 Dated this 4th day of January, 2024.

11 /s/
12 Fernando M. Olguin
13 United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28